

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

35 USC 102, 103

The Office rejected claims 1-21 as being anticipated by, or obvious over Enchos (US 2002/0185637).

Upon further review, the Applicant agrees that the Office was entirely correct in asserting that Enoch shows a panel drive assembly where first and second panels are disposed in different planes. What the Applicant was trying to define, was the more limited concept of the panels widths defining planes that are not co-planar. Hopefully the revised claim language sufficiently clarifies that point.


The Applicant also wishes to stress that Enoch's fabric drive is not really a panel drive because the fabric pieces are too narrow. A panel drive uses fabric pieces that are sufficiently wide to prevent motion in the width-plane of the fabric. That distinction has a very significant effect on the lateral stability of the lift, and indeed is responsible for a preferred embodiment of the claimed invention being able to operate with only a single scissors stabilizer.

In contrast, Enoch is forced to use stabilizers in both "x" and "y" axes precisely because his fabric strips provide only *de minimis* side-to-side stability. In view of the current clarifying amendments and discussion, it is hoped that the pending claims can all be allowed.

Request For Allowance

Claims 1-21 are pending in this application. The applicant requests allowance of all pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,
FISH & ASSOCIATES, PC

By 
Robert D. Fish
Reg. No. 33880

Fish & Associates, PC
2603 Main Street, Suite 1050
Irvine, CA 92614-6232
Telephone (949) 253-0944
Fax (949) 253-9069